

ATTACHMENT 4: Projects of Concern Evaluation Forms

December 20, 2005

Individual SRFB Project Review Panel 2005 Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Chelan County
Project Sponsor: City of Leavenworth
Project Name: **Leavenworth Fish Screen**
Project Number: 05-1618R #1 of 9
Project Location: Lat. 47 32 38 Long. -120 42 39
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual #18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why? #7

The project uses a technique that has not been considered to be successful in the past.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

The application must state that part of the design will be to work with the Agencies to identify the best screen design for this site and not necessarily commit to a Coanda-type screen.

The RTT mentioned other diversion-related problems at the site. The applicant needs to state whether there are other diversions at or below the site that are not within the fish-screening criteria.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

The proposal is to place an additional screen within the intake facility of the water treatment plant. Icicle Creek provides important habitat for multiple life-stages of bull trout.

Individual SRFB Project Review Panel 2005 Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Grays Harbor
Project Sponsor: Lewis County Public Works
Project Name: **Frase Creek Barrier Removal**
Project Number: 05-1592 R
Project Rank: 9 of 12
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual #18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why? #5, 11

The Fish Passage Evaluation Sheet describes problems with using the "stream simulation" culvert design at this site, including backwatering by Newaukum River, extensive grade control, and potential on-going maintenance problems.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

The evaluator recommends increasing the project cost by about 60% to install a bridge instead.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments

Individual SRFB Project Review Panel 2005 Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Grays Harbor
Project Sponsor: Heernett Environmental Found
Project Name: **Sampsom Property- 80 Acre Acquisition**
Project Number: 05-1593 A
Project Rank: 10 of 12
Project Type: Acquisition

Please refer to Manual #18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why? #10

The information provided in the proposal is not sufficient to determine the need for the project. In particular, given the presence of forested wetlands and creeks on the property, which would be protected from development under the local CAO, no information is provided regarding which parts of the property are actually developable and how this development would actually impact salmon habitat.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

Provide information about what the actual threat to habitat is from development under local CAO rules. A map that clearly shows the actual developable portion of the property would be helpful. Also, discuss whether more cost-effective options, such as a conservation easement, have been considered.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments

Individual SRFB Project Review Panel 2005 Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Grays Harbor
Project Sponsor: **Grays Harbor County LE**
Project Name: Alder Creek Fishway Installation
Project Number: 05-1598 R
Project Rank: 12 of 12
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual #18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why? #4

Given the low PI number and the large capital expense involved, the proposal fails to justify the costs of this project.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

Specific recommendations are provided in the Fish Passage Evaluation Sheet.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments

Individual SRFB Project Review Panel 2005 Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Lower Columbia Fish Recov Bd
Project Sponsor: Lower Columbia River FEG
Project Name: **Hamilton Creek Restoration**
Project Number: 05-1559 R
Project Rank: 6 of 21
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual #18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why? #5, 9

We appreciate the applicant's efforts to respond to our questions, however we remain concerned that the rock vanes will be buried by high sediment loads.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments

The project would have extremely limited benefits to salmonids that would be at high risk of failure.

Individual SRFB Project Review Panel 2005 Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Lower Columbia Fish Recov Bd
Project Sponsor: Lower Columbia Fish Recov Bd
Project Name: **North Fork Toutle River Fish Passage**
Project Number: 05-1432 N
Project Rank: 8 of 21
Project Type: Non Capital

Please refer to Manual #18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why? 20

The context of the project is not fully developed because the long-term operation of the Sediment Retention Structure (SRS) is unclear. Therefore, it is unclear how any spillway retrofit to allow fish passage will fit in with the SRS long-term operation.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

A letter of support from the US Corps of Engineers would be helpful.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments

Individual SRFB Project Review Panel 2005 Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Lower Columbia Fish Recov Bd
Project Sponsor: Lower Columbia Fish Recov Bd
Project Name: **Influence of Carcass Analogs**
Project Number: 05-1616 N
Project Rank: 9 of 21
Project Type: Non Capital

Please refer to Manual #18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why? #15, 20

There is insufficient information on the study design and technical approach.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

The initial SRFB funding (fifth round) with sponsor match was meant to support 2 years of analog placements in two basins. Due to budget shortfalls, funding was only sufficient to support 1 1/2 year of work in one basin. The Panel is unwilling to support continued monitoring efforts.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments

The sponsor decreased the original cost of the project by 50% based on earlier Panel comments. The Panel suggests that funding be sought through more traditional sources available to academic and federal government researchers.

This is an interesting applied ecological research project, however the Panel does not believe the study results would lead to high priority projects.

Individual SRFB Project Review Panel 2005 Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Lower Columbia Fish Recov Bd
Project Sponsor: Lower Columbia Fish Recov Bd
Project Name: **WRIA Based Proj Development - Coweeman**
Project Number: 05-1610 N
Project Rank: 13 of 21
Project Type: Non Capital

Please refer to Manual #18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why? #16

The response provides increased certainty of proceeding in the right direction, but the proposal still lacks specific information on the scope of work making it difficult to evaluate its potential for developing restoration projects that provide a high benefit to salmon. The Panel would recommend conducting the highest ranked assessment (Cowlitz) as a pilot project to help inform the development of a more robust project development process for the other watersheds (Elochoman and Coweeman).

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

The methodology should be quantitative, repeatable and must be designed to diagnose the source of habitat or process impairment. If this approach is adopted, careful documentation of cost will be important. The Panel would like to see much more focus if a habitat assessment project is to be undertaken. Considerable planning and assessment work has already been completed in this recovery area and is presented in the Lower Columbia River Salmon Recovery Plan, Sub-basin Plans and Appendices. This work should be the basis for advancing our understanding of habitat conditions. In developing a more focused assessment approach that will lead to the identification of credible projects for the achievement of recovery goals, specific linkages must be made.

These connections should be the basis for a hypothesis that links priority species, life history stages, river reaches, limiting factors and a methodology. In this kind of assessment approach, the methodology becomes the means by which the hypothesis is tested and forms a quantitative framework for identifying the type, location and scope of restoration projects. The methodology should be quantitative, repeatable and must be designed to diagnose the source of habitat or process impairment.

Successful completion of project #05 –1599, resulting in a strategic project list should guide the methodology for this assessment.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments

Individual SRFB Project Review Panel 2005 Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Lower Columbia Fish Recov Bd
Project Sponsor: Lower Columbia Fish Recov Bd
Project Name: **WRIA Based Proj Developpment - Elochoman**
Project Number: 05-1609 N
Project Rank: 14 of 21
Project Type: Non Capital

Please refer to Manual #18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why? #16

The response provides increased certainty of proceeding in the right direction, but the proposal still lacks specific information on the scope of work making it difficult to evaluate its potential for developing restoration projects that provide a high benefit to salmon. The Panel would recommend conducting the highest ranked assessment (Cowlitz) as a pilot project to help inform the development of a more robust project development process for the other watersheds (Elochoman and Coweeman).

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

The Panel would like to see much more focus if a habitat assessment project is to be undertaken. Considerable planning and assessment work has already been completed in this recovery area and is presented in the Lower Columbia River Salmon Recovery Plan, Sub-basin Plans and Appendices. This work should be the basis for advancing our understanding of habitat conditions. In developing a more focused assessment approach that will lead to the identification of credible projects for the achievement of recovery goals, specific linkages must be made.

These connections should be the basis for a hypothesis that links priority species, life history stages, river reaches, limiting factors and a methodology. In this kind of assessment approach, the methodology becomes the means by which the hypothesis is tested and forms a quantitative framework for identifying the type, location and scope of restoration projects. The methodology should be quantitative, repeatable and must be designed to diagnose the source of habitat or process impairment.

Successful completion of project #05 –1599, resulting in a strategic project list should guide the methodology for this assessment.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments

Individual SRFB Project Review Panel 2005 Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Lower Columbia Fish Recov Bd
Project Sponsor: Lewis County Conservation Dist
Project Name: **Cispus River Riparian Restoration**
Project Number: 05-1596 R
Project Rank: 16 of 21
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual #18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why? #1, 5, 13

It is unclear that the project addresses a salmonid problem.
The project does not account for the conditions or processes in the watershed.

Episodic natural disturbances like the one that occurred in 1996 in the upper Cowlitz basin are expected events that will occur again. Over time these events create highly productive habitat for many species of fish and wildlife. The relatively broad alluvial valley of the Cispus River is coupled closely with steep headwater channel networks that periodically can deliver high volumes of sediment to downstream reaches. Ample seed sources of native hardwood species are present to successfully colonize gravel bar tops dating to the flood and will naturally regenerate riparian forests.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments

The Review Panel appreciates the additional information supplied by the sponsor and Lead Entity.

Individual SRFB Project Review Panel 2005 Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Lower Columbia Fish Recov Bd
Project Sponsor: Lower Columbia Fish Recov Bd
Project Name: **Gorley Springs Restoration Design**
Project Number: 05-1617 N
Project Rank: 19 of 21
Project Type: Non Capital

Please refer to Manual #18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why? #18, 20

The assessment does not account for the conditions or processes in the watershed, or may be in the wrong sequence with other habitat assessment or restoration activities.

The application states that the site lies in one of the most dynamic reaches of the Grays River and is a historic and present depositional zone exhibiting a high degree of lateral instability with frequent channel avulsions. Projects in such an area should be expected to have a high degree of "failure."

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

Even though this project is based on early findings in the draft geomorphic analysis currently ongoing, the Review Panel would like to see the entire final report to help determine if this is the correct approach. A better approach to the sequence would be to wait for this analysis before proceeding to project design.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments

Individual SRFB Project Review Panel 2005 Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Okanogan County
Project Sponsor: Okanogan Conservation District
Project Name: **Transfer Ditch Barrier and Piping**
Project Number: 05-1620 R # 4 of 9
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual #18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why? #2, 3

The project is dependant on other key conditions being addressed first, i.e. the diversion of all late season water at the Thurlow diversion.

Information provided, or current understanding of the system, is not sufficient to determine the need for, or the benefit of, the project. See additional comments below.

Only conveyance water will be conserved, so the only possible instream benefit is in the primary reach. Late season flow in lower Beaver Creek will not improve.

How long is the primary reach? This information was requested, but has not been provided by the applicant.

Given that the applicant is unwilling to commit to placing the conserved conveyance water in the trust program, there is no assurance that the saved water will remain in the creek.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

A late summer site visit would've been helpful. The Panel was unable to ascertain project benefits, because the project site's proximity to other diversions is unknown. The project drawings are incomplete and unclear. The Panel was unable to determine what the project is doing, or how it is affecting water savings.

Individual SRFB Project Review Panel 2005 Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Okanogan County
Project Sponsor: Colville Confederated Tribes
Project Name: **Culvert Replacement on Omak Creek**
Project Number: 05-1532 R #6 of 9
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual #18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why? #2, 8 10

It is unclear what problem to salmonids the project is addressing, there is a low potential threat if the project is not completed and it is unclear how the project will achieve its stated benefit.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

More information that substantiates high risk of failure is needed. Even though the culvert appears undersized, the Panel has no idea how undersized the pipe is relative to different flood frequencies. The culvert appears to have been in place for at least 10 years without any documented problems of erosion, washouts, or debris build-up.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Individual SRFB Project Review Panel 2005 Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Okanogan County
Project Sponsor: Okanogan Co Noxious Weed Board
Project Name: **Okanogan Co Salmon Habitat Enhancement**
Project Number: 05-1444 R #8 of 9
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual #18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why? #4,

This project would have some benefits to salmonids but the cost/benefit ratio is high. Absent landowner agreements, there is no assurance that riparian vegetation on private lands would persist.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

Develop landowner agreements to ensure that riparian restoration areas are maintained.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Cost estimate summary not completed accurately (see p 2).
Project is similar to one proposed in 2004.

Individual SRFB Project Review Panel 2005 Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: San Juan Marine Resources Committee (WRIA 2)
Project Sponsor: Center for the Study of Coast Salish Environments
Project Name: **Genetic Stock Identification of San Juan Juvenile Salmon**
Project Number: 05-1527N # 2 of 5
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual #18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☒ N
Why? #15, 20

The proposed methodology provides a "pilot" level study that does not appear sufficient to achieve its stated objective. The Panel has concerns with the applicant's assertion that genetic testing in a one year study focusing on two habitat types (four unprotected gravelly beach stations and one protected bay control station) will provide sufficient data to inform policy changes in San Juan County that could provide increased protection for salmon, particularly at a stock specific and habitat type specific level.

The Panel recognizes the research value of investigating which stocks utilize the WRIA 2 nearshore during their out migration as juveniles; however, it is unclear how the limited amount of information collected by the proposed project would lead to protection or restoration projects.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments

This type of proposal raises the question of whether SRFB wants the Panel to identify proposed projects as POCs if they are salmon research projects that may not directly lead to salmon restoration or protection efforts.

Individual SRFB Project Review Panel 2005 Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: WRIA 1
Project Sponsor: Whatcom County Public Works
Project Name: **East Acme Farm Community Restoration**
Project Number: 05-1570 R
Project Rank: 3 of 5
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual #18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why? #5, 13

The proposed project attempts to improve salmon habitat while addressing local community concerns about potential flooding risks associated with implementing the previously-funded SRFB project No. 01-1329 C "Acme/Saxon Phase 1 Instream Restoration". The Review Panel previously noted that, with respect to restoring salmon habitat, the project design does not adequately account for geomorphic conditions and processes in the reach. In particular, the main purpose of much of the proposed work is to discourage natural channel migration along several hundred feet of the undeveloped right floodplain, including land located within a county-owned conservation area. The applicant provided extensive comments to justify the project's flood control aspects within the context of Whatcom County flood hazard planning and the WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Plan.

While the Panel concurs that the design makes sense from the standpoint of protecting residential properties and roads located about one mile north of the project site in the event of a catastrophic channel avulsion into a relic river channel, we cannot overlook the fact that the bank armoring along the county park land will actually hinder the function of salmon habitat-forming landscape processes at this location relative to existing conditions. The applicant believes that allaying the community's concerns about possible channel avulsion – and thus gaining public support for Project No. 01-1329C – outweighs the project's negative impact to ecological processes. The Panel acknowledges and appreciates the applicant's effort to balance these conflicting interests, but because the primary purpose of the project is to protect property, we believe that it is inconsistent with the SRFB project technical evaluation criteria.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?
As noted in previous comments, the Panel suggests that the project scope be modified to maximize floodplain connectivity without adverse impacts to community infrastructure.
3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments